



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/416,757	10/12/1999	LILA MADOUR	040010-440	6600

27045 7590 08/06/2003

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVW2-C-2
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

WAXMAN, ANDREW

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2667

13

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/416,757	MADOUR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Andrew M Waxman	2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-15 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 and 8-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-4, 8, 9, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by over Turunen (US Patent No. 6,477,644).

Regarding claim 1, Turunen discloses a method including receiving packets over a first connection in a first network (see col. 2 lines 18-22), requesting a second connection with a second network while moving towards the second network (see col. 2 lines 23-26), and acquiring an address of a second gateway associated with the second network (see col. 2 lines 26-27). Turunen also discloses establishing a tunnel between the first (Home Agent) and second (Foreign Agent) gateways and routing packets from the first gateway to the second gateway and then to the mobile device (see col. 2 lines 38-47 and 50-52). By routing from the first gateway (HA) in the first network (Home Network) over the Internet to a second gateway (FA) in a second network (Foreign network), thereby traversing one or more routers that are incapable of routing to the destination node and establishing a tunnel. See also FIG. 1.

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Turunen further disclose the second gateway (foreign agent) initiating, transmitting the second gateways address (see col. 2 lines 26-27), the request for the establishment of the tunnel.

Regarding claim 3, Turunen further discloses the first gateway (HA) initiating, forwarding packets to the second gateway in a second network (see col. 2 lines 50-52), the request for the establishment of the tunnel.

Regarding claim 4, Turunen further discloses the mobile host initiating, transmitting the second gateways address (see col. 2 lines 27-29), the request for the establishment of the tunnel.

Regarding claim 9, Turunen further discloses the second gateway retrieving the address of the first gateway from a centralized database. This is inherent to Turunen because the first gateway (HA), as disclosed by Turunen, contains a database storing identities of mobile hosts within its network thereby classifying it as a centralized database. Furthermore, the identity (network address) would be provided by the first gateway to the second gateway in the source address portion of the header, which is essential to packet communications.

Regarding claim 11, it is inherent to Turunen that the identity (network address) would be provided by the first gateway to the second gateway in the source address portion of the header, which is essential to packet communications.

Regarding claim 13, Turunen further discloses the mobile device providing the first data network with the identity of the second gateway. See col. 2 lines 27-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 10, 12, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turunen.

Regarding claim 10, Turunen discloses all of the limitations as recited above with respect to claim 1,

Turunen does not expressly disclose the first gateway is a Gateway General Packet Radio Services Serving Node.

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a Gateway General Packet Radio Services Serving Node as the first gateway in the invention as disclosed by Turunen.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to make the invention, as disclosed by Turunen, conform to a widely used mobile networking standard, thereby making the invention more profitable.

Regarding claim 12, Turunen discloses all of the limitations as recited above with respect to claim 3.

Turunen does not expressly disclose the first gateway buffering data intended for the mobile device until the tunnel has been established with the second gateway.

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include buffering the data intended for the mobile device until the tunnel has been established with the second gateway into the invention as disclosed by Turunen.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this to prevent unnecessary loss of packet data, thereby providing for a more reliable, and efficient communication system.

Regarding claim 15, Turunen discloses all of the limitations as recited above with respect to claim 1.

Turunen does not disclose the communications network using a MobileIP Protocol.

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make use of the MobileIP networking protocol in the invention as disclosed by Turunen.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to make the invention, as disclosed by Turunen, conform to a widely used mobile networking protocol standard, thereby making the invention more profitable.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Turunen in view of Caceres et al. ("Fast and Scalabe Wireless Handoffs in Support of Mobile Internet Audio"), hereinafter referred to as Caceres.

Regarding claim 14, Turunen discloses all of the limitations as recited above with respect to claim 4.

Turunen does not expressly disclose the mobile device providing the second network with the network identity of the first gateway.

Caceres discloses the mobile host sending a greet message when entering a new network, which includes the network address of the MH default gateway. See page 354, 2nd column, pgh. 3-4.

At the time the invention was made it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to send a greet message, when entering a new network, which includes the network address of the Mobile Host's default gateway, as disclosed by Caceres, in the invention as disclosed by Turunen.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to provide for a more efficient handoff between gateways within networks. See page 354 1st column pgh. 5.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 8-15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Turunen (US Patent No. 6,484,211) discloses a mobile internet protocol for mobility of access host between networks.

Kalliokulju discloses handover between mobile communication networks.

Pollini discloses "Handover Protocols between Metropolitan Area Networks."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew M Waxman whose telephone number is (703) 305-8086. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on (703) 305-4378. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Andrew M. Waxman

July 25, 2003



CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 8/4/03